Please cite as: EUAA, '6.2. Safety' in *Country Guidance: Iran*, Enero 2025.

6.2. Safety

COMMON ANALYSIS
Last update: January 2025

The first step in the analysis of IPA is to identify a particular part of the country with regard to which the criteria of Article 8 QD/QR would be examined in the individual case.

The example of **Tehran** has been selected as the capital, biggest city, and economic centre of Iran.

The selection of Tehran for this common analysis and guidance note does not prevent case officers from considering the application of IPA for other parts of Iran, provided that all criteria described hereunder are met.

☐ 6.2.1. Absence of persecution or serious harm

When examining the element ‘absence of persecution or serious harm’, the decision-maker should refer to chapters 2 to 5 of this document.

When assessing the requirement of safety with regard to the applicability of IPA in individual cases of applicants from Iran, the following elements should be taken into account:

General security situation in relation to indiscriminate violence

The general security situation in the particular part of the country that is being examined as an alternative for internal protection in the individual case should be

assessed in accordance with the analysis under the section on Article 15(c) QD/QR.

The conclusion with regard to **Tehran**, is as follows:

In Tehran, there is, in general, no real risk for a civilian to be personally affected within the meaning of Article 15(c) QD/QR.

Actor of persecution or serious harm and their reach

In case where the person fears persecution or serious harm by State actors (e.g. political dissidents, ethnic and religious minorities), there is a presumption that IPA would not be available (Recital 27 QD/QR).

In some cases, where the applicant faces persecution or serious harm for reasons related to the prevalent social norms in Iran, especially for women and girls, and the actor of persecution or serious harm is the Iranian society at large (e.g. for Individuals perceived to have transgressed Islamic norms or laws, Women and girls and Persons with diverse SOGIESC (also referred to as LGBTIQ persons), taking into account the reach of the actor of persecution or serious harm, the general lack of State protection for such applicants and their vulnerability to potential new forms of persecution or serious harm, the safety criterion would in general not be met.

Whether the profile of the applicant is considered a priority target and/or a threat by the actor of persecution or serious harm

The profile of the applicant could make him or her a priority target, increasing the likelihood that the actor of persecution or serious harm would attempt to trace the applicant in the potential IPA location (e.g. honour-related violence, etc.)

Behaviour of the applicant

It is recalled that an applicant cannot be reasonably expected to abstain from practices fundamental to his or her identity, such as those related to religion or sexual orientation, in order to avoid the risk of persecution or serious harm21.

Other risk-enhancing circumstances

The information under the chapter Refugee status should be used to assist in this assessment.

☐ 6.2.2. Availability of protection against persecution or serious harm

Alternatively, case officers may determine that the requirement of safety is satisfied if the applicant would have access to protection against persecution or serious harm as defined in Article 7 QD/QR in the area where IPA is considered. In the case of persecution by the State, a presumption of non-availability of State protection applies.

See the chapter on Actors of protection.

The requirement of safety may be satisfied in Tehran, depending on the profile and the individual circumstances of the applicant. For those who have a well-founded fear of persecution by the Iranian authorities and/or by society at large, the criterion of safety would generally not be met in Tehran.

See other contents related to Internal Protection Alternative:

- Preliminary remarks
- 6.1. Part of the country
- *6.2. Safety*
- 6.3. Travel and admittance
- 6.4. Reasonableness to settle
- 6.4.1. General situation
- 6.4.2. Individual circumstances
- 6.4.3. Conclusions on reasonableness

- 21

  CJEU, *Minister voor Immigratie en Asiel* v *X and Y and Z* v *Minister voor Immigratie en Asiel*, joined cases C-199/12 to C-201/12 judgment of 7 November 2013, *X and Y and Z*, paras. 70-76, https://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?text=&docid=144215&pageIndex=0&doclan

  CJEU, *Bundesrepublik Deutschland* v *Y and Z*, joined cases C-71/11 and C-99/11, judgment of 5 September 2012, para. 80, https://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?docid=126364&doclang=en

© European Union Agency for Asylum 2026 | Email: info@euaa.europa.eu